UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/666,788	09/17/2003	Yeung Siu Yu	LFS0097USDIV	9001
27777 PHILIP S. JOH	7590 05/02/200 NSON	EXAMINER		
JOHNSON & J	OHNSON	FORMAN, BETTY J		
ONE JOHNSON & JOHNSON PLAZA NEW BRUNSWICK, NJ 08933-7003			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1634	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			05/02/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

		Applica	tion No.	Applicant(s)		
Office Action Summary		10/666,	788	YU ET AL.		
		Examin	er	Art Unit		
		BJ Form	ian	1634		
Period fo	- The MAILING DATE of this commun r Reply	ication appears on t	he cover sheet with th	ne correspondence a	ddress	
A SHO WHIC - Exten after t - If NO - Failur Any re	DRTENED STATUTORY PERIOD F HEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE M sions of time may be available under the provisions SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this comn period for reply is specified above, the maximum st e to reply within the set or extended period for reply sply received by the Office later than three months a d patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	AILING DATE OF of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no nunication. atutory period will apply and will, by statute, cause the a	FHIS COMMUNICAT event, however, may a reply b will expire SIX (6) MONTHS to pplication to become ABANDO	FION. be timely filed from the mailing date of this ONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	·	
Status						
2a)⊠ 3)□	Responsive to communication(s) file This action is FINAL . Since this application is in condition closed in accordance with the practi	2b)∏ This action is for allowance exce _l	non-final. ot for formal matters,		ne merits is	
Dispositi	on of Claims					
5)⊠ 6)⊠ 7)□ 8)□	Claim(s) <u>21-26</u> is/are pending in the la) Of the above claim(s) is/a Claim(s) <u>21-25</u> is/are allowed. Claim(s) <u>26</u> is/are rejected. Claim(s) is/are objected to. Claim(s) are subject to restrice	re withdrawn from c				
	on Papers					
10) -	The specification is objected to by the Grawing(s) filed on is/are: Applicant may not request that any objected to graving sheet(s) including the oath or declaration is objected to	a) accepted or lection to the drawing(s the correction is requ) be held in abeyance. uired if the drawing(s) is	See 37 CFR 1.85(a). sobjected to. See 37 C	, ,	
Priority u	nder 35 U.S.C. § 119					
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 						
2) Notice (3) Inform	(s) e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (For the control of the control o	PTO-948)	4) Interview Summ Paper No(s)/Ma 5) Notice of Inform 6) Other:			

Art Unit: 1634

FINAL ACTION

Status of the Claims

1. This action is in response to papers filed 4 February 2008 in which claims 1 and 26 were amended. The amendments have been thoroughly reviewed and entered.

The previous rejections in the Office Action dated 14 December 2007 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are withdrawn in view of the amendments.

The previous rejections under obviousness-type double patenting are maintained.

Applicant's arguments have been thoroughly reviewed. The arguments in combination with the amendments are found persuasive to overcome the previous rejections under 35 U.S.C. 103.

Claims 21-26 are under prosecution.

Double Patenting

2. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., In re Berg, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); In re Goodman, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); In re Longi, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); In re Van Ornum, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); In re Vogel, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and In re Thorington, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

3. Claim 26 rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 1 of U.S. Patent No. 6,716,577 in view of Bamdad (U.S. Patent No. 6,306,584, filed 10 April 1997) or Backhaus et al (U.S. Patent No. 5,869,001, issued 9 February 1999).

Instant Claim 26 and patent Claim 1 are both drawn to test strips. The claims differ in that the test strip of instant Claim 26 is within a "system" comprising an "automated instrument". Test strips within systems comprising automated instruments were well known in the art at the time the claimed invention was made as taught by both Bamdad and Backhaus. Bamdad teaches the test strip as described above wherein the test strip is present in an automated instrument designed to work with test strips (Columns 23-24, e.g. network analyzer, Column 24, lines 43-56) and Backhaus et al teach the similar test strip is present in an automated instrument which is designed to work with test strips e.g. spectrophotometer (Column 6, lines 3-23). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the claimed invention was made to apply the automated instrument of Bamdad and Backhaus to the patent test strip for the obvious benefit of networked analysis of reaction on the test strip as taught by Bamdad (Column 24, lines 43-56).

Furthermore, the courts have stated that broadly providing an automatic or mechanical means to replace a manual activity that accomplished the same result is not sufficient to distinguish over the prior art (see: *In re Venner*, 262 F.2d 91, 95, 120 USPQ 193, 194 (CCPA 1958)) (see MPEP 2144.04 III). Therefore, the combining the patent test strip with an automated instrument would not distinguish the combination over the patent test strip.

Response to Comments

4. Applicant acknowledges the above obviousness-type double patenting rejection and states that a terminal disclaimer will be submitted upon indication of allowable subject matter. The rejection is maintained and made Final.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 21-25 are allowed.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to BJ Forman whose telephone number is (571) 272-0741. The examiner can normally be reached on 6:00 TO 3:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ram Shukla can be reached on (571) 272-0735. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 1634

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private

PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you

would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the

automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

BJ Forman Primary Examiner Art Unit 1634

/BJ Forman/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1634